MEYERTONS
HOOD
KIVLIN
KOWERT
& GOETZEL

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS & UNFAIR COMPETITION

700 LAVACA, SUITE 800
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701
TELEPHONE (512) 853-8800
FACSIMILE (512) 853-8801

FAX

To: Examiner Philip Wang	From: Paul Seegers
Fax: 571-273-5934	Pages: 2 (including cover)
Phone: 571-272-5934	Date: October 23, 2009
Re: U.S. Application No. 10/646,416	Phone: (512) 853-8878

Please see the attached agenda for our interview. Let me know if 1pm EST works for you.

Interview Agenda

Amended Claim

1.   (Currently Amended) A method comprising:

a computer system converting an installation package ~~program~~ usable to install a software application on a target processing system from a first format to a second format, wherein the first format does not permit streaming of the ~~software application~~ installation package, and wherein the second format permits streaming of the ~~software application~~ installation package, and wherein the converted installation package includes a plurality of dummy files, each of which is a file that corresponds to a respective actual file of the software application, wherein at least one of the plurality of dummy files is subsequently replaceable with its corresponding actual file; and

the computer system streaming the converted installation package ~~program~~ to the target processing system over a network, wherein said streaming causes the converted installation package ~~program~~ to configure the target processing system for execution of the software application.

Section 112 Rejections

Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Applicant's specification does not support "permit[ting] streaming of the software application," as recited in the previous version of claim 1. Applicant submits that support for this limitation can be found, for example, in paragraph [0025]. Nevertheless, Applicant is amenable to amending claim 1 to recite "wherein the first format does not permit streaming of the installation package, [and] wherein the second format permits streaming of the installation package." Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner previously suggesting amending claim 1 in a similar manner.

Section 103 Rejections

In the rejection of claim 7, the Examiner indicated that "a file number [in Holler] corresponds to a dummy file." Office Action at 7. While Holler refers to a SAS package having multiple files, Applicant submits that none of those files is a "dummy" file, as none of those files is "subsequently replaceable" with a "corresponding actual file" of the software application being installed. The fact Holler's files each include identifiers does not make these files "dummy" files, nor can metadata about a file be considered a "file" itself. Applicant thus suggests amending claim 1 as outlined above.